

"Express Mail" Mailing Label No. EL530711135US
Date of Deposit: October 16, 2000
I hereby certify that this paper or fee is
being deposited with the United States
Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to
Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10 on
the date indicated above and is addressed
to: ATTENTION: Board of Patent Appeals and
Interferences, Assistant Commissioner for Patents,
Washington, D.C. 20231

Keith A. Johnson



#14
K. Colf
12/20/00
1-3

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| | | |
|----------------------|---|--|
| IN RE APPLICATION OF | : | Keller et al. |
| FOR | : | GOLF BALL WHICH INCLUDES FAST-CHEMICAL-REACTION-PRODUCED COMPONENT AND METHOD OF MAKING SAME |
| SERIAL NO. | : | 09/040,798 |
| FILED | : | March 18, 1998 |
| GROUP ART UNIT | : | 3711 |
| EXAMINER | : | Steven Wong |
| LAST OFFICE ACTION | : | November 5, 1999 |
| ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | : | P-5550 SLD 2 0207 |

Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2518
October 16, 2000

RECEIVED
OCT 26 2000
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.192

ATTENTION: Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences
Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

This brief is in furtherance of the Notice of Appeal that was filed in this case on May 2, 2000.

10/25/2000 CNGUYEN 00000119 09040798

01 FC:120 310.00 OP
02 FC:118 1390.00 OP

The fees required under § 1.17, and any required petition for extension of time for filing this brief and fees therefor, are dealt with in the accompanying Transmittal of Appeal Brief.

Appellants file herewith an Appeal Brief in connection with the above-identified application, wherein claims 1-44 were finally rejected in the Office Action of November 5, 1999. What follows is Appellants' Appeal Brief (submitted in triplicate) in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.192(a):

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST (37 C.F.R. §1.192(c)(1))

The real parties in interest in this appeal are the inventors named in the caption of this brief (Victor Keller, Thomas J. Kennedy, III, William Risen, Jr.) and the assignee, Spalding Sports Worldwide, Inc..

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES (37 C.F.R. §1.192(c)(2))

Currently, there are no other appeals or interferences in process or pending before the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office that will directly affect or be affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this Appeal.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS (37 C.F.R. §1.192(c)(3))

The status of the claims set forth after the Final Office Action mailed November 5, 1999 and after the Advisory Action mailed February 16, 2000, was, and is, as follows:

Allowed claims: none

Rejected claims: 1-44

The present appeal is directed specifically to claims 1-44.

IV. STATUS OF THE AMENDMENTS (37 C.F.R. §1.192(c)(4))

In the final Office Action of November 5, 1999, the Examiner rejected claims 1-44 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,779,562 to *Melvin et al.* or U.S. Patent No. 5,813,923 to *Cavallaro et al.* each in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,762,322 to *Molitor et al.* In the Advisory Action of February 16, 2000, the Examiner

entered the proposed amendments to the specification recited in the Appellants' Response dated February 4, 2000.

V. SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION 37 C.F.R. §1.192 (c)(5)

The present invention is directed to a process of making a multi-piece golf ball (claim 1). The process comprises making at least one cover component and core component of the ball by mixing two or more reactants that react and form a reaction product with a flex modulus of 5-310 kpsi in a reaction time of 5 minutes or less (claim 1). The component has a thickness of at least 0.01 inches and a demold time of 10 minutes or less (claim 1).

The present invention is also directed to a multi-piece golf ball comprising a reaction injected molded material comprising polyurethane/polyurea (claim 14).

Additionally, the present invention is directed to a process for producing a golf ball including the step (a) of: reaction injecting molding a polyurethane/polyurea material to form at least one of a core layer and a cover layer of the ball (claim 38).

Moreover, the present invention is directed to a process for producing a golf ball comprising (a) forming a core, (b) covering the core, (c) coating and adding indicia to the covered ball (claim 40). The process further comprises at least one of the steps (a) and (b) comprising reaction injection molding of a polyurethane/polyurea material (claim 40).

Furthermore, the present invention is directed to a golf ball comprising at least one fast-chemical-reaction-produced layer (claim 42). The fast-chemical-reaction-produced layer has a flex modulus of 5-310 kpsi in a reaction time of 5 minutes or less and a thickness of at least 0.01 inches (claim 42).

The present invention is also directed to a golf ball having a core and a cover, wherein the cover comprises polyurethane/polyurea which is formed from the reactants, 5-100 percent weight of which are obtained from recycled polyurethane/polyurea (claim 44).

VI. ISSUES (37 C.F.R. §1.192(c)(6))

Whether claims 1-44 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,779,562 to *Melvin et al.* or U.S. Patent No. 5,813,923 to *Cavallaro et al.* each in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,762,322 to *Molitor et al.*

VII. GROUPING OF CLAIMS (37 C.F.R. §1.192(c)(7))

No two or more of the claims at issue, i.e., claims 1-44, stand or fall together. That is, each claim recites separately patentable subject matter. This is explained in greater detail below.

VIII. ARGUMENTS (37 C.F.R. §1.192(c)(8))

The Examiner's Rejection of Claims 1-44 as Being Obvious and Unpatentable Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Over U.S. Patent No. 5,779,562 to Melvin et al. or U.S. Patent No. 5,813,923 to Cavallaro et al. each in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,762,322 to Molitor et al. Is Erroneous and Must be Reversed.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-44 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the *Melvin* (U.S. Patent No. 5,779,562) patent, or the *Cavallaro* (U.S. Patent No. 5,813,923) patent, each in view of the *Molitor* (U.S. Patent No. 4,762,322) patent. The basis for the Examiner's rejection is as follows:

Claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Melvin et al.* (562) or *Cavallaro et al.* (923), each in view of *Molitor et al.* (322). The latter reference renders it obvious to mold the polyurethane layers of the primary reference golf balls by a reaction injection molding process, since each is an obvious expedient for providing the desired resiliency in a golf ball, as illustrated by the secondary reference. Any other possible distinctions over said thus modified golf balls are deemed conventional molding techniques that would necessarily be used in such molding process.

(See Office Action of June 8, 1999, pp. 3-4).

Moreover, the Examiner made the following additional observations:

5. Applicant's arguments filed September 13, 1999 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding the statement that *Molitor* does not disclose the reaction injection molding process for golf balls, the rejection is over the combination of *Melvin et al.* or *Cavallaro et al.*, each in view of *Molitor et al.* *Melvin et al.* and *Cavallaro et al.* teach golf ball constructions having polyurethane outer

covers, however, they lack the teaching for forming the covers by a reaction injection molding process. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to form the outer polyurethane covers of Melvin et al. and Cavallaro et al. by reaction injection molding method in order to take advantage of the known benefits of the method. Note column 3, lines 12-23 of Molitor et al. which detail these advantages (i.e. low density, high strength to weight ratio).

6. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

7. The applicant's arguments that one of ordinary skill would not be led from the golf ball art to utilize a method which is known in golf club heads is not persuasive. The examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, all references are directed to sports articles which utilize polyurethane outer covers. Also, the sports articles are subjected to severe impacting wherein a high strength to weight ratio would be a desirable quality for the articles. Attention is also directed to column 14, lines 36-47 of Cavallaro et al. and column 18, lines 59-63 of Melvin et al., which state that the outer layer may be injection or compression molded. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize reaction injection molding instead of injection molding to form the outer polyurethane layer of either Cavallaro et al. or Melvin et al. for the reasons advanced by Molitor et al.

Attention is directed to column 5, lines 18-21 of Molitor et al. which specifically states that reaction injection molding is a well known technique. The applicant is requested to note that the specific characteristics of the method and the product obtained therefrom have been considered to be obvious given the statement by Molitor et al. that RIM is a well known method and lacking a showing of the characteristics criticality by a new and unexpected result.

(See FINAL Office Action of November 5, 1999, pp. 3-4).

A. The Examiner's Cited References

U.S. Patent No. 5,779,562 to *Melvin et al.* is directed to a solid golf ball comprising a multi-layered core and multi-layered cover. In preparing golf balls in accordance with *Melvin et al.*, a hard inner cover layer is molded (by injection molding or compression molding) about a core, preferably a soft core. (Col. 18, lines 59-62). A comparatively softer outer layer is molded over the inner layer. (Col. 18, lines 62-63).

U.S. Patent No. 5,813,923 to *Cavallaro et al.* is directed to a multi-layered golf ball comprising a core, cover layer, and mantle layer disposed between the core

and cover layer. The golf ball taught in *Cavallaro et al.* may be made by any known conventional process employed in the golf ball art. (Col. 14, lines 36-37). The solid cores can be either injection or compression molded. (Col. 14, lines 37-39). Also, the undersized wound cores are produced through conventional means. (Col. 14, lines 39-40). The mantle layer is subsequently injection or compression molded about the core. (Col. 14, lines 41-42). The cover layer or layers are then injection or compression molded or cast about the mantle layer. (Col. 14, lines 44-46).

U.S. Patent No. 4,762,322 to *Molitor et al.* is directed to a golf club. The golf club may have a variety of angles, depending on the club desired. The clubs may be formed of a low density, high strength material such as a reaction injection molded (RIM) polyurethane. (Col. 2, lines 28-30).

B. The Subject Matter of Claims 1-44 are Patentably Distinguishable Over the Cited Art

Claims 1-44 are not obvious in light of the combination of *Melvin* or *Cavallaro* with *Molitor*.

First, no motivation exists to combine *Melvin* or *Cavallaro*, which teaches golf balls, with *Molitor*, which teaches golf clubs. Nothing in *Melvin*, *Cavallaro*, or *Molitor* teaches or even suggests the combining of golf ball art with the golf club art. More particularly, one skilled in the art, upon reading *Melvin*, *Cavallaro*, and *Molitor*, would not be motivated to utilize molding methods in golf clubs for golf balls. In fact, the Examiner's reasoning for combining *Melvin* or *Cavallaro* with *Molitor* is because golf balls and golf clubs fall under the same general classification of "sports articles." Clearly, the fact that golf balls and golf clubs are considered "sports articles" does *not* mean that one skilled in the art would be *motivated* to combine portions of the two separate and distinct technologies.¹ Thus, the Examiner's reasoning for combining two golf ball references with one golf club reference clearly does not show how one skilled in the art would be motivated to combine different technologies.

¹ Under the Examiner's view, it should be proper to leap from the art of wooden baseball bats to the baseball art; or from the art of composite tennis racquets to tennis balls. Each of these articles embody a separate field of art.

Furthermore, the Examiner's combination of golf ball art in *Melvin* or *Cavallaro* with golf club art in *Molitor* is impermissible hindsight reconstruction. Clearly, the Examiner's references themselves do not teach one skilled in the art to combine golf ball technology with golf club technology. In fact, based upon the present references, it is not known whether reaction injection molding used in making golf clubs (having a certain set of product requirements) can be used to form golf balls (having another, different set of product requirements). As such, no motivation whatsoever can be found to combine the two distinct technologies in the Examiner's cited references.

Specifically, the complete lack of motivation to combine *Melvin* or *Cavallaro*, two golf ball references, with *Molitor*, a golf club reference, can be shown by the time each particular technology has been known. *Molitor*, which discloses the reaction injection molding process for golf clubs, was issued on August 9, 1988, more than four years before the filing date of the parent *Melvin* application and more than six years before the filing date of the *Cavallaro* application. Reaction injection molding technology was known at the time *Cavallaro* and *Melvin* was filed, yet neither of these references teaches the use of reaction injection molding in golf balls. Therefore, if any motivation existed for using reaction injection molding technology in golf clubs for golf balls, it would likely be disclosed in the *Melvin* and *Cavallaro* patents. But, such disclosure does not exist. As such, no motivation exists to combine the Examiner's cited references and the Examiner's attempt to combine such references is impermissible hindsight reconstruction.

In particular, the Examiner's cited references neither teach nor even suggest combining golf ball art with golf club art in order to obtain the process recited in independent claim 1. Similarly, the Examiner's cited references provide no motivation for combining their teachings to obtain the process recited in independent claims 38 and 40. Furthermore, no motivation exists in combining the Examiner's cited references for a multi-layered golf ball comprising a reaction injection molded material comprising polyurethane/polyurea as recited in independent claim 14. Also, no motivation exists to combine the Examiner's cited references to form the golf balls recited in independent claims 42 and 44.

Claims 2-13, 15-37, 39, 41, and 43, which are dependent or ultimately dependent from claims 1, 14, 38, and 42 and recite additional features, are also not

obvious in light of the Examiner's cited references since no motivation exists in the Examiner's references. It is respectfully submitted that many of the significant and important features recited in these dependent claims were essentially ignored during prosecution. These claims call for specific aspects and characteristics of the recited golf balls and related processes. As explained herein, the prior art relied upon by the Examiner does *not* teach or even suggest these aspects.

In addition, the present claims 1-44 not only recite particular features, but also combinations of features. Even if the Examiner's cited references teach or suggest certain features recited in claims 1-44, the Examiner's cited references entirely fail to teach or suggest the combination of features recited in claims 1-44.

Furthermore, even if *Melvin* or *Cavallaro* could be combined with *Molitor*, the combination of these references would not render the present claims 1-44 obvious. Specifically, all pending claims 1-44 of the present application are patentable over the noted references for at least the following reasons.

1. Claims 1-13

Independent claim 1 recites a process for a multi-piece golf ball by making at least one cover component and core component of the ball by mixing two or more reactants that react and form a reaction product. The reaction product has a flex modulus of 5-310 kpsi in a reaction time of 5 minutes or less. The component has a thickness of at least 0.01 inches and a demold time of 10 minutes or less. The combination of *Melvin* or *Cavallaro* with *Molitor* does not teach or even suggest a single feature recited in claim 1, let alone the combination of features recited in claim 1. *Particularly, the Examiner's references neither teach nor suggest the reaction product having a flex modulus of 5-310 kpsi in a reaction time of 5 minutes or less; and a component formed from the reaction product having a thickness of at least 0.01 inches and demold time of 10 minutes or less.* The mere mention of the possible use of polyurethane in a golf ball by *Melvin* and *Cavallaro* in no way would provide sufficient motivation to lead a formulator to employ a reaction product having a flex modulus of 5-310 kpsi in a reaction time of 5 minutes or less, and to utilize a component formed from that reaction product having a thickness of at least 0.01 inches and a demold time of 10 minutes or less. Furthermore, the description by *Molitor* of using a RIM

polyurethane for manufacturing a club head fails to remedy the deficiencies of *Melvin* and *Cavallaro*.

Since the Examiner's cited references neither teach nor suggest the features recited in claim 1, that claim is not obvious in light of the Examiner's cited references. Claims 2-13, which are dependent or ultimately dependent from claim 1 and recite additional features, are also not obvious in light of the Examiner's cited references.

2. Claims 14-37

Independent claim 14 recites a multi-layered golf ball comprising a *reaction injection molded material comprising polyurethane/polyurea*. That feature is simply not taught by any of the cited references. Furthermore, as discussed above, one skilled in the art would not have been motivated to combine the Examiner's cited references at the time of filing of the present application since the Examiner's cited references of *Cavallaro* or *Melvin* in view of *Molitor* are related to two different arts (i.e., golf balls and clubs). Thus, claim 14 is not obvious in light of the Examiner's cited references. Dependent claims 15-37 recite additional aspects in further combination with the features called out in independent claim 14. Many of these claims specify particular chemical characteristics and/or physical properties for the reaction injection molded polyurethane/polyurea. For instance, claim 36, dependent from independent claim 14, recites the polyurethane/polyurea material as incorporating meta-tetramethylxylylene diisocyanate. There is absolutely no teaching or suggestion for such a feature from the limited disclosures of the cited art.

3. Claims 38-39

Independent claim 38 recites a process for producing a golf ball including the step of *reaction injection molding a polyurethane/polyurea material* to form at least one of a core layer and a cover layer of the ball. Again, that feature is not taught by the cited art. No motivation exists for combining *Cavallaro* or *Melvin*, which teach golf balls, with *Molitor*, which teaches golf clubs. Therefore, claim 38 is not obvious in light of the Examiner's cited references. Claim 39 depends from claim 38 and further recites the process of including a step recycling at least 20% of the polyurethane/polyurea that is

produced in connection with step (a), but which is not incorporated into the ball during that step. There is absolutely no mention of this feature in any of the cited art.

4. Claims 40-41

Independent claim 40 recites a process for producing a golf ball comprising (a) forming a core; (b) covering the core; (c) coating and adding indicia to the covered ball. The process of claim 40 further recites at least one of the steps (a) and (b) comprising *reaction injection molding of polyurethane/polyurea material*. As previously explained, the cited art fails to teach this aspect. In addition, no motivation exists to combine *Cavallaro* or *Melvin* with *Molitor* in order to teach the combined features of claim 40. Thus, claim 40 is not obvious in light of the Examiner's cited references. Claim 41 is dependent from claim 40 and further recites the process as comprising a step of recycling at least 20% of the RIM-produced material comprising polyurethane that was produced consequent to step (a).

5. Claims 42-43

Independent claim 42 recites a golf ball comprising *at least one fast-chemical-reaction-produced layer. The fast-chemical-reaction-produced layer has a flex modulus of 5-310 kpsi in a reaction time of 5 minutes or less and a thickness of at least 0.01 inches*. As already discussed above, no motivation exists for combining the Examiner's cited references of *Cavallaro* or *Melvin* with *Molitor*. Also, the Examiner's cited references neither teach nor suggest a fast-chemical-reaction-produced layer. More particularly, the Examiner's cited references neither teach nor suggest the combination of a fast-chemical-reaction-produced layer having a flex modulus of 5-310 kpsi in a reaction time of 5 minutes or less and a thickness of 0.01 inches. For at least these reasons, claim 42 is not obvious in light of the Examiner's cited references. Dependent claim 43 further recites the ball as having a multi-layer cover and an inner cover layer including the at least one fast-chemical-reaction-produced layer.

6. Claim 44

Independent claim 44 recites a golf ball having a core and cover wherein *the cover comprises polyurethane/polyurea which is formed from the reactants, 5-100*

percent of which are obtained from recycled polyurethane/polyurea. As explained above, no motivation exists to combine *Cavallaro* or *Melvin* with *Molitor* to teach the combination of features recited in claim 44. Additionally, the Examiner's cited references neither teach nor suggest the particular features of a cover comprising polyurethane/polyurea formed from reactants, 5-100 percent of which are obtained from recycled polyurethane/polyurea. For at least these reasons, claim 44 is not obvious in light of the Examiner's cited references.

IX. CONCLUSION


In view of the above, Appellants respectfully submit that claims 1-44 are non-obvious and patentable over the combination of *Molitor* with *Melvin* or *Cavallaro*.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-44 be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE LLP

DATED: October 16th, 2000



Richard M. Klein
Reg. No. 33,000
Mark E. Bandy
Reg. No. 35,788
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2518
Telephone: (216) 861-5582
Facsimile: (216) 241-1666

X. APPENDIX OF CLAIMS (37 C.F.R. §1.192(c)(9))

1. A process of making a multi-piece golf ball comprising making at least one of a cover component and a core component of the ball by mixing two or more reactants that react and form a reaction product with a flex modulus of 5 - 310 kpsi in a reaction time of about 5 minutes or less, the component having a thickness of at least 0.01 inches and a demold time of 10 minutes or less.

2. A process according to claim 1, wherein the reaction product comprises at least one member selected from the group consisting of polyurethanes, polyureas, epoxies and unsaturated polyesters.

3. A process according to claim 1, wherein the reaction process comprises reaction injection molding.

4. A process according to claim 1, wherein the reaction product comprises at least one member selected from the group consisting of polyurethane and polyurea.

5. A process according to claim 4, wherein the reaction product with a flex modulus of 5 - 300 kpsi is formed in a reaction time of about 3 minutes or less.

6. A process according to claim 4, wherein the component has a thickness of at least 0.02 inches.

7. A process according to claim 4, wherein the component includes a cover component.

8. A process according to claim 7, wherein the cover component is a dimpled cover layer and the cover component has a thickness of at least 0.02 inches.

9. A process according to claim 7, wherein the cover component has a hardness of 20 - 95 Shore D.

10. A process according to claim 7, wherein the cover component has a hardness of 30 - 75 Shore D.

11. A process according to claim 1, wherein the component includes a core component.

12. A process according to claim 2, further including the step of recycling at least a portion of the reaction product.

13. A process according to claim 12, wherein the reaction product is recycled by glycolysis.

14. A multi-piece golf ball comprising a reaction injection molded material comprising polyurethane/polyurea.

15. A golf ball according to claim 14, wherein the reaction injection molded material comprising polyurethane/polyurea includes at least one of ether functional groups and ester functional groups.

16. A golf ball according to claim 14, wherein at least 5% of the polyurethane/polyurea is formed from molecules obtained by recycling a material comprising one of polyurethane, polyurea, polyester, and polyethylene glycol.

17. A golf ball according to claim 14, wherein recycling takes place by glycolysis.

18. A golf ball according to claim 14, wherein the ball has a core and a cover and at least the cover comprises reaction injection molded polyurethane/polyurea material.

19. A golf ball according to claim **18**, wherein the ball includes an exterior coating surrounding the cover.

20. A golf ball according to claim **18**, wherein the core is solid, multi-layer, wound, liquid filled, metal filled and/or foamed.

21. A golf ball according to claim **18**, wherein the cover has a flex modulus of 5 - 310 kpsi.

22. A golf ball according to claim **18**, wherein the cover has a flex modulus of 5 - 100 kpsi.

23. A golf ball according to claim **18**, wherein the exterior coating is applied over the cover after molding of the cover.

24. A golf ball according to claim **18**, wherein the hardness of the cover is 20 - 95 Shore D.

25. A golf ball according to claim **18**, wherein the hardness of the cover is 30 - 75 Shore D.

26. A golf ball according to claim **25**, wherein the flexural modulus of the cover is in the range 5 to 100 kpsi.

27. A golf ball according to claim **18**, wherein the flexural modulus of the cover is higher than that of the core.

28. A golf ball according to claim **18**, wherein the ball has a multi-layer cover.

29. A golf ball according to claim **18**, wherein the cover comprises a reaction injection molded material comprising polyurethane and further comprises at

least one member selected from the group consisting of optical brightener, pigment, dye, antioxidant, and UV light stabilizer.

30. A golf ball according to claim **18**, wherein the cover further comprises a filler.

31. A golf ball according to claim **30**, wherein the filler includes at least one member selected from the group consisting of glass, metal, minerals, oxides, sulfides, titanates, polymeric resins and ceramics.

32. A golf ball according to claim **14**, wherein the ball has a core and a cover, and at least the core comprises a reaction injection molded polyurethane/polyurea material.

33. A golf ball according to claim **30**, wherein the core comprises at least two components and at least one core component comprises reaction injection molded polyurethane/polyurea material.

34. A golf ball according to claim **14**, wherein the ball has a core, and a cover, each of which comprises reaction injection molded polyurethane/polyurea material.

35. A golf ball according to claim **30**, wherein the cover comprises an ionomer.

36. A golf ball according to claim **14**, wherein the polyurethane/polyurea material incorporates meta-tetramethylxylylene diisocyanate.

37. A golf ball according to claim **18**, wherein the cover has a generally uniform consistency both at the seam and the poles.

38. A process for producing a golf ball including the step (a) of: reaction injection molding a polyurethane/polyurea material to form at least one of a core layer and a cover layer of the ball.

39. A process according to claim 38, further comprising a step of (b) recycling at least 20% of the polyurethane/polyurea that is produced in connection with step (a) but which is not incorporated into the ball during that step.

40. A process for producing a golf ball comprising (a) forming a core, (b) covering the core, and © coating and adding indicia to the covered ball, wherein at least one of steps (a) and (b) comprises reaction injection molding of a polyurethane/polyurea material.

41. A process according to claim 40, further comprising a step of (d) recycling at least 20% of the RIM-produced material comprising polyurethane that was produced consequent to step (a).

42. A golf ball comprising at least one layer comprising polyurethane/polyurea which is formed from reactants, said layer having a flex modulus of 5-310 kpsi in a reaction time of 5 minutes or less and a thickness of at least 0.01".

43. A golf ball according to claim 42, wherein said ball has a multi-layer cover and said at least one fast-chemical-reaction-produced layer is an inner cover layer.

44. A golf ball having a core and a cover, the cover comprising polyurethane/polyurea which is formed from reactants, 5 - 100 weight percent of which are obtained from recycled polyurethane/polyurea.